

6. EUROPEAN DIPLOMACY IN CONFLICT RESOLUTION

6.1 European diplomacy in resolving the Ukrainian crisis

6.2 European Union's policy in Syria

6.1 European diplomacy in resolving the Ukrainian crisis

The crisis in Ukraine broke out in November 2013, when the then-current President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich, refused to sign an Association Agreement at the Vilnius Summit. The agreement was supposed to be the cornerstone of future relations between the EU and Ukraine and the successor to the former Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA) in the future. The agreement was incorporated into the European Neighborhood Policy, which was developed as a follow-up to the EU enlargement. The main element of the association was the creation of a deep and comprehensive free trade zone, which would gradually integrate Ukraine into the European single market. Though the membership of Ukraine does not concern Moscow, Moscow considered an Association Agreement as threat to the foreign policy. Not wanting to lose Ukraine, Russia began large-scale trade sanctions against Ukraine in the summer of 2013 and thereby pressured Yanukovich administration in order not to sign the agreement. Ukraine's accession to the Eurasian Union was much more profitable for Russia. As a result of the President's refusal to sign an agreement, thousands of Ukrainian citizens went to the streets to protest this decision and the government as a whole. The violence escalated on February 20, 2014 on Maydan Square in Kiev, when several people died after government actions. The result was a very unstable and unsafe situation in Ukraine. The interim government appointed under these conditions was accused by Russia of threatening the rights of Russian minorities living in Ukraine, especially on the Crimean peninsula. Within a few days, the Crimean parliament initiated a referendum on the inclusion of the Crimea into Russia. The following statement on the annexation of the Crimea by Russia on March 18, 2014 strongly challenged and worsened relations with the West. The EU regards annexation as the violation of international law and territorial integrity, as well as the sovereignty of Ukraine. Soon after the annexation, the Union imposed the first round of sanctions on Russian officials and high-ranking Moscow allies in Ukraine [1].

After the Ukrainian troops left the Crimea, trouble spread to the east of Ukraine: protesters occupied government buildings in the cities of Donetsk and Lugansk, industrial regions of Ukraine, and on May 11, separatists in Donetsk and Lugansk declared independence of the "people's republics" after referendums that were not recognized neither by Kiev nor the West. On May 25, following the presidential elections, Petr Poroshenko came to power with 55% of the vote. In fairness it should be noted that the city of Donetsk and a number of other places did not participate in the voting. On September 5, Ukraine and the Donetsk and Lugansk rebels agreed on a cease-fire in the capital of Belarus. Just 4 days later, the agreement signed in Minsk was violated by the fierce battles at the Donetsk airport. There were also repeated truce violations at other points. In January 2015,

hostilities continued in and around Donetsk and in the Lugansk region. Thus, the rebels tried to strengthen their positions in case of any “peace negotiations” that might take place. On February 12, as a result of a series of negotiations, an agreement was reached on the cessation of hostilities. The respective leaders of Russia, Ukraine, Germany and France announced a cease-fire starting from February 15. The deal included the removal of weapons and the exchange of prisoners, as well as a buffer zone for heavy weapons between the Ukrainian and separatist territories. Separatists in eastern Ukraine have also signed an agreement.

The unique nature of the EU’s activities was expressed in the designation of acute problems for policy making in this situation. At the same time, the EU’s ability to set priorities and develop common policies was hampered by the diverging interests of Member States. This is especially true for the CFSP and the CSDP, whose activities, figuratively speaking, are very sensitive, as they are related to the issue of the sovereignty of Member States, where decisions (with some exceptions) are taken unanimously. As it is known, if the interests or external dependence of Member States diverge or even contradict each other, it is difficult to accept or develop any common position. Therefore, vertical coherence is especially important, as its absence between Member States can lead to a serious limitation of the EU’s activity.

Mechanisms traditionally used to achieve foreign policy goals include political (diplomacy / negotiations), economic (incentives / sanctions) or military means. However, the EU’s ability to use them depends on overcoming the problem of vertical consistency of Member States.

The EU, as a rule, has access to all three types of mechanisms, but the possibility of using military tools to ease the crisis in Ukraine has been excluded from the outset. This is due to the self-identification of the EU as a “soft power” and a regulatory actor. Excluding the military intervention, the EU reconstructs and thus emphasizes its normative identity. This illustrates how and how much the EU’s identity as a regulatory authority affects the EU’s ability to act in the international arena.

Diplomacy is fully compliant with the EU regulatory values and may be the “softest” foreign policy tool for promoting the EU objectives with third parties. This fact determines the appointment of the post of High Representative of the Union of Foreign Affairs and Security Policy (HR), who is also the vice-president of the European Commission. At the first stage of the Ukrainian crisis, Catherine Ashton was the HR, but now this post is held by Federica Mogherini. The first diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict, according to C. Ashton, were made by the leaders of the Weimar Triangle (Germany, France, and Poland). Negotiations to resolve the security problems of the region took place in the so-called closed Normandy format by Germany, Russia, France and Ukraine, although there was no official mandate from other countries. The High Representative and other representatives of the EU institutions were absent from these negotiations. The negotiations led to the conclusion of a ceasefire agreement (Minsk I) in September 2014. Thus, Germany and France, which took the initiative, contributed to the EU’s conflict resolution activities, but this fact caused concern to other Member

States about the legitimacy of their leadership. The negotiations continued to remain outside the EU institutions and led to the conclusion of the second Ceasefire Agreement (Minsk II), which was again proposed in the Normandy format in February 2015. Thus, due to Russia's lack of progress in implementing the terms of the agreement, main Member States continued its work on maintaining a single EU line on the sanctions policy regarding Russia. Therefore, Mogherini limited herself to explaining the decisions of the European Council to the outside world.

The Minsk II Agreement showed that open war was replaced by the other form of limited war. However, the fighting never ceased completely. In addition, despite the efforts undertaken by the western side in the "Norman format", none of the sections of the Minsk Agreement has been fully implemented yet.

In the diplomatic and expert circles there is a widespread belief that the agreement is "impracticable". Its complexity and "impracticability" is associated with unpredictable actions of the separatists. Nevertheless, there is a conviction that a better agreement could not be reached, and consequently, the West has no choice but to limit it. It is difficult to refute the idea that it is impossible to achieve a better compromise between Kiev and Moscow. However, some time later it has become obvious that a more realistic approach is required in relation to both Russia and Ukraine to fit into the circumstances.

The still persisting significance of Member States in the CFSP is also underscored by the fact that third parties, such as the US government or Members of the Ukrainian pro-European opposition supported bilateral negotiations with individual Member States. The involvement of the HR in resolving the crisis was not disputed only by the Member States governments, but also by the Presidents of the European Council and Commission, Hermann Rompuy and Manuel Barroso. These "peat wars" among the EU bodies undermine the position and recognition of the HR as an external spokesman of the EU, as well as demonstrate the lack of "institutional consistency". This fact indicates that Member States are not really ready to abandon their external policy. "High Representative, no matter who he is, cannot be a partner in negotiations with the President of Russia. In this case, only the President of the European Council can be such a partner who represents the EU from outside at the level of heads of state on issues where the Commission has no competence". Due to the unwillingness of the EU to provide military assistance, the taken restrictive measures are a very important tool of foreign policy to promote the goals of the CFSP, which are "peace, democracy and respect for the rule of law, man and international law". Therefore, if the EU implements these restrictive measures as a single player, then it will be able to have more political weight and symbolic power, conducted by individual Member States. The implementation of unanimity in the Council is always the risk of relaxing measures to reach "consensus". This problem is well illustrated by the crisis in Ukraine. The EU is perceived as "too weak player" and the EU was unable to reach a consensus - to build a strong response, as a result of which only superficial sanctions were allowed. One of the reasons was the internal disunity of the EU regarding the benefits of these measures, i.e. Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Finland

openly criticized. It should also be noted that the reluctance of Germany to impose tough sanctions in conjunction with the pro-Russian bloc, consisting of Cyprus, Bulgaria and Greece seriously questioned the ability of the EU to compete with Russia in its common region. This was somewhat expected, given the weak position of the EU due to the dependence of both large and small Member States on Russian energy supply and trade. Formation of a unified position in this situation, of course, was difficult. Despite these disagreements, the EU reaction after the Russian annexation of the Crimea was relatively tough and unified. The EU still managed to formulate a common position through active diplomacy. The EU requirements were supported by a three-stage sanctions regime. This includes (1) diplomatic sanctions; (2) “targeted measures” against individuals and legal entities, including travel bans and freezing of assets in the European Union; (3) sectoral economic sanctions. Thus, the EU implemented two of these steps at once, allocated significant funds to assist in order to avoid the bankruptcy of Ukraine, and even all 28 Member States supported this policy. As the crisis developed, the EU also gradually increased its restrictive measures, including sectoral sanctions aimed at the Russian oil industry, the financial sector and the military industry. This was indeed intended to harm Russia, but the harm was done to the Union itself. How did the EU achieve the necessary unity for these steps?

The EU Member States have become aware of the seriousness and importance of the situation, which has led to their sufficient and correct assessment in order to reasonably redistribute their cost-benefit calculations. Nobody, of course, wanted to lose valuable Russian business, and those states that are on good terms with Moscow had a fear of putting them at risk. However, it became clear to all that the predictable short-term losses caused by the tightening of sanctions are much less than the potential long-term costs associated with changing the Eurasian security landscape. The external pressure of the United States also contributed to this. Thus, according to experts, the unity of the EU on the issue in Ukraine was a victory. Nowhere was this perspective clearer than in Germany. Angela Merkel said that Germany could suffer losses that the EU imposed sanctions against Moscow, most likely and in the first place they will harm the country's economy. The statement by A. Merkel was also addressed directly to the German business community, which had previously warned that it would not accept a more assertive stance towards the Kremlin. Experts believe that this change may mark a shift in the EU's foreign policy towards a more strategic, long-term approach. The existing contrast between the normative obligation of the EU (arising from its presence as a normative agent) and the material interests of Member States still prevents the EU from acting in accordance with the first one. However, the transition to a more long-term centralized approach will increase the likelihood that the EU will act in accordance with its normative identity in the future.

The November conflict between Kiev and Moscow was a new round of crisis, which caused a violent international reaction. The incident occurred on November 25 in the Kerch Strait, when the Russian side opened fire on three Ukrainian ships and took 23 sailors under guard. The parties propose different versions of what happened: Russia declared that the Ukrainian side did not warn about the passage

of ships and violated sea borders, calling everything provocation, while Ukraine claims that it had warned the Russian side in advance. An emergency meeting of the UN Security

Council was convened, which did not resolve the situation to anything. The European Union reacted strongly to what happened, urging Russia to restore free movement across the strait and release the captured ships and people. The EU statement also mentioned that the construction of a bridge across the Kerch Strait is illegal, violating international law and the sovereignty of Ukraine. The EU representatives said that measures regarding Russia are being discussed, since any decision in the foreign policy sphere requires unanimity.

Thus, we see that the European Union was directly involved in resolving the conflict in Ukraine through diplomatic negotiations that fully reflect the EU's intentions, as well as its image, corresponding to the regulatory framework of its activities and adherence to the policy of "soft" power. Therefore, it is difficult to talk about the success of the EU's policy in resolving this conflict, since the crisis itself is still ongoing and, judging by the latest events it's not clear yet.

Conflict Matrix / Eastern Ukraine

Type of conflict: confrontation (civilian war periods) of the central authorities of a unitary state and separate movements for self-determination and autonomy of the territory part and part of the state population.

Parties to the conflict:

Direct participants

- the central government of Ukraine (Kiev);
- separatist movement for separation or autonomy of the Lugansk People's Republic;
- separatist movement for separation or autonomy of the Donetsk People's Republic.

Indirect participants

- Western community represented by the leadership of the United States, Great Britain, and a number of other western countries supporting the goal of complete subordination of the separatist territories
- Russian leadership supporting the legitimization of a high degree of autonomy of the LPR / DPR within the Ukrainian state.

International intervention and resolving: at the stage of lengthy protests on Kiev's "Maydan", the Western community provided political, financial and organizational support to the anti-government opposition which led to a regime change. There is no UN mandate for any form of external force. In Ukraine, there is the OSCE Monitoring Mission (up to 1000 people in 10 regions), two OSCE small border missions, and the UN Human Rights Council mission on the identification of humanitarian problems. The Parliament (Verkhovna Rada) of Ukraine appealed to the UN and the EU with the request to deploy a full-fledged police operation to control the eastern territories and regain control over the eastern Ukraine-Russia border.

The results of the intervention, the outcome of the resolving: change of the government (de facto coup d'etat) and change in the country's political orientation as a result of Western support for anti-government forces. Formation of the Minsk process of political consultations between conflicting parties and mediating powers (Normandy format - Ukraine, Russia, France, Germany and - in a non-state status – the LPR/DPR). The conclusion of the Minsk Peace agreements, the establishment of a ceasefire on the border of the eastern territories. Creating a system of international monitoring of the situation.

Chronology of the conflict

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| | 2013 |
| September-October | In Ukraine, the confrontation between supporters of concluding an association agreement with the European Union, on the one hand, and supporters of maintaining economic and political orientation towards Russia and the CIS, on the other is intensifying. |
| November November 24 | The leadership of Ukraine, headed by President V. Yanukovich, has announced that the authority suspends preparations for conclusion of the Association Agreement with the European Union. In Kiev, on the European Square the largest opposition rally was held, which was called “For European Ukraine” by the organizers of the People's Council. |
| December 2 | Several thousand supporters of European integration built barricades at the entrances to the Kiev Independence Square, putting a cordon around the perimeter. |
| | 2014 |
| February 21 | The European Union and Russia are trying to perform intermediary functions. The President of Ukraine V. Yanukovich and the opposition leaders, mediated by representatives of the European Union and Russia, signed the Agreement “On the settlement of the political crisis in Ukraine”. |
| February 22 | V. Yanukovich left Kiev. The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, taking upon itself the actual leadership of the country, changed the Constitution of the country, the leadership of the Parliament and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and also removed President Viktor Yanukovich from power. |
| February 23 | The speaker of the Verkhovna Rada L. Turchinov was appointed Acting President of Ukraine by the resolution of the Verkhovna Rada. Four days later, a new government headed by Premier A. Yatsenyuk is approved. |
| March 1 | Russia regards the change of power in Ukraine as an illegal coup d'état. Russian President Vladimir Putin makes an appeal to the Council of Federation for permission to use if necessary the armed forces of the Russian Federation on the territory of Ukraine until the normalization of the socio-political situation in this country. |

| | |
|----------|---|
| March 2 | The speaker of the Supreme Council of the Crimea V. Konstantinov appealed to the residents of the autonomy with a request to support the transition to state independence in the upcoming Referendum. |
| March 16 | In the referendum on the status of the Crimea, 96.77% of the residents of the peninsula participated in voting spoke out for reunification with the Russian Federation. In Sevastopol, 95.6% of referendum participants supported the entry into the Russian Federation. |
| March 17 | The Supreme Council of the Crimea declared the Republic an independent state and appealed to Russia with a proposal for its admission to the Russian Federation as a subject with the status of the Republic. |
| March 18 | The President of Russia V. Putin, the Chairman of the State Council of the Republic of the Crimea N. Konstantinov, the Prime Minister of the Republic S. Aksenov and the Mayor of Sevastopol L. Chaly signed an interstate agreement on the admission of the Republic of the Crimea to the Russian Federation and the formation within it of new subjects. |
| March | In eastern Ukraine, protests are held. Their members do not recognize the legitimacy of the new governors appointed after the removal of the President Yanukovich from power, and demand the federalization of the country. |
| April 7 | The protesters announced the establishment of the People's Council of the Donetsk region, which in turn announced its intention to create the Donetsk People's Republic (DPR) and become part of Russia after the Referendum on this issue. Also, the Donetsk People's Council adopted an appeal to the Russian Federation with a request to introduce a peacekeeping contingent. |
| April 10 | The deputies of the Lugansk Regional Council demanded that the central authorities of Ukraine abolish the anti-terrorist operation (ATO) in the east of the country, hold an all-Ukrainian Referendum on the federal structure of the country and legislate the status of the Russian language. The authority of the DPR decided to create their own People's army. |
| April 13 | The Council of National Security and Defence of Ukraine decided to launch in the eastern regions of the country "a large-scale anti-terrorist operation involving the armed forces". |
| April 14 | Ukraine proposed that the UN should conduct an operation of the UN peacekeeping forces together with the Ukrainian Army in the east of the country. |
| April 15 | The National Security Council of Ukraine allowed the army to engage in an anti-terrorist operation. |

| | |
|----------|---|
| April 18 | Deputies of the Lugansk Regional Council demanded that the Verkhovna Rada and the Cabinet of Ministers declare a Referendum on the state structure of Ukraine and the status of the Russian language. |
| April 28 | Protesters in Lugansk announced the creation of the Lugansk People's Republic (LPR). The “people's governor” of Donbas P. Gubarev, who was proclaimed by rally, said that after the Referendum on independence in the south-east of Ukraine, a federal state of Novorussia may appear, uniting Donetsk and Lugansk. |
| April 29 | Five mining settlements of the Donetsk region of Ukraine, located along the route Donetsk-Lugansk raised the flags of the DPR. |
| May 2 | As a result of the fire in the House of Trade Unions in Odessa, made by nationalist radicals, the rally participants for independence of the Odessa region from Kiev were killed: 32 people suffocated from the smoke and gas, 10 people crashed, getting out of the windows of the building, 6 people died from gunshot wounds. Another 214 people were injured. |
| May 5 | Supporters of the federalization of Ukraine occupied the Donetsk Executive Committee. In Slavyansk, the OSCE observers were released; they were captured 10 days before. |
| May 7 | Russian President V. Putin called for supporters of federalization to postpone the Referendum in the east of Ukraine. |
| May 11 | Donbass held Referendums on the status of Lugansk and Donetsk regions. In the Donetsk region, 89.7% of referendum participants voted for self-determination and 96.2% in the Lugansk region. |
| May 12 | DPR and LPR proclaimed themselves sovereign states following the Referendum held on May 11. |
| May 16 | The Prosecutor General's Office of Ukraine recognized the DPR and LPR as terrorist organizations. The Supreme Council of the Republic of Donetsk adopted the Constitution of the self-proclaimed state, defining the DPR as the Parliamentary Republic with two state languages - Ukrainian and Russian. |
| May 19 | The Republican Assembly of the self-proclaimed Lugansk People's Republic appealed to the UN with a request to recognize sovereignty. Martial law has been introduced in the LPR. All military service men from 18 to 45 years old are mobilized. |
| May 20 | In the east of Ukraine, a “warning strike” was launched against the actions of the militias, initiated by the Ukrainian oligarch Rinat Akhmetov. The action takes place under the slogan "For Donbass without weapons!" |
| May 22 | The Ukrainian authorities urged to urgently convene a meeting of the UN Security Council regarding the situation in Ukraine. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| June 20 | The Supreme Council of the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic appealed to the United Nations with a request to recognize its sovereignty. |
| June 27 | The European Union and Ukraine have signed the economic bloc of the Association Agreement. |
| July 2 | Summit of the foreign ministers of Russia, Germany, France and Ukraine was held in Berlin. An agreement was reached on the full-scale negotiations in the framework of the contact group to resolve the Ukrainian crisis. |
| July 11 | Russia has deployed on its territory 35 temporary accommodation centers for refugees from eastern Ukraine regions, in which large-scale armed clashes between militias and Kiev Armed Forces are continued. |
| July 14 | Russia, without waiting for the establishment of a cease-fire regime in the south-east of Ukraine, in good order invited the OSCE observers to the check points "Donetsk" and "Gukovo" from the Russian side border with Ukraine. |
| July 17 | Boeing 111 of the Malaysian Airlines company that made the flight Amsterdam-Kuala Lumpur crashed in the Donetsk region. |
| August | The regular delivery of humanitarian aid from Russia to Eastern Ukraine begins. |
| September 5 | The tripartite contact group in the Ukraine-Russia-OSCE format took place in Minsk. A consensus was reached concerning peaceful resolving and a cease-fire agreement in eastern Ukraine. The special envoy of the President P. Poroshenko, former President of Ukraine L. Kuchma, the Russian Ambassador to Kiev M. Zurabov, the official representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office for resolving conflict in Ukraine X.Tagliavini, the leaders of the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Lugansk People's Republics L. Zakharchenko and I. Plotnitsky participated in negotiations. |
| September 7 | The OSCE has published a protocol on the proposed 12 joint steps to resolve the crisis. |
| September 20 | Principle consent to conclude a Memorandum on the implementation of the cease-fire regime was reached on September 5. Therefore, after regular talks the members of the contact group on Ukraine, as well as the leaders of the DPR and the LPR signed this document in Minsk. |
| October 16 | The President of Ukraine P. Poroshenko signed the Law on the special status of Donbass. But the LPR and the DPR are not satisfied with many of the wording of the law and its short duration. |
| October 17 | A bilateral meeting between the Presidents of Russia and Ukraine was held behind closed doors in Milan, during the Asia-Europe Meeting summit (ASEM). The implementation of the Minsk Agreements to resolve the situation in Ukraine was discussed. |

| | 2015 |
|--------------|---|
| January 12 | In Berlin, the foreign ministers of the Norman Four countries (Russia, Ukraine, France and Germany) held a meeting. At the meeting they discussed the situation in Ukraine, as well as the prospects and terms of a possible summit. |
| February 11 | Negotiations of the “Norman Four” countries leaders, such as Russia, Ukraine, France and Germany were held in Minsk. The meeting lasted about 16 hours. Its main result was the adoption of two documents to resolve the Ukrainian crisis: a Joint Declaration of the leaders and an Agreement on a set of measures, directed to the implementation of the Minsk Agreements from September of the last year. The first item of the approved set of measures by the “Norman Quartet” (the so-called agreement “Minsk-2”) was the declaration of the cease-fire regime in Donbass from February 15, 2015. |
| March 17 | Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine approved the list of regions of Donbass, which are subject to a special order of local self-government. |
| February 26 | The OSCE records a significant decrease in the intensity of shootings in Donbas; Ukrainian Armed Forces began to withdraw heavy artillery; DPR militia brought out 90% of heavy weapons. |
| June- August | Meetings of the heads and experts of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were held in the “Norman format” in Paris and Berlin. The OSCE observers have documented regular violations by both sides of the “silence regime” in Donbass - from 40 to 800 shots per day. The OSCE mission and Russian military observers were shelled. |
| August | On selected dates, the OSCE records up to 1,000 rounds and projectiles fired. The UN publishes the report, stating that about 5 million people in Ukraine need humanitarian assistance. |
| September 29 | Representatives of the OSCE, Russia and Ukraine announced the initialing of a Treaty on withdrawing from the line of the warring parties contact with weapons of a caliber less than 100 mm. |
| October | Convoys delivered with humanitarian assistance by the International Committee of the Red Cross. |
| November 3 | The President of Ukraine Petr Poroshenko signed a Bill legalizing the status of foreign military mercenaries in the country. |
| December 30 | The “Norman Four” agreed to extend the term of the Minsk Agreements for the next year and, if necessary further. |

2016

| | |
|------------|---|
| January 1 | An Association Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union entered into force, including provisions relating to the Free Trade Area (FTA). |
| April-July | New tensions in eastern Ukraine. The OSCE records regular cease-fire violations on both sides. |
| August | Ukraine broke off diplomatic relations with Russia. |

* The matrix and chronology of the conflict in Eastern Ukraine // Nikitin A.I. International conflicts: intervention, peacemaking, resolving. -M., 2017.-384 p. (pp.297-302)

6.2 European Union's Policy in Syria

The war in Syria is one of the most serious humanitarian crises faced by the world after World War II. It continues to have a devastating and tragic impact on Syrian citizens. It also has an increasingly destabilizing effect on the entire region through the movement of people, the exacerbation of political and religious divisions and spread of terrorism.

The EU's main position is that only an agreed political decision, as defined in the United Nations Security Council Resolution 2254 and Geneva Communiqué (2012) will ensure lasting stability in Syria and liquidate in the country the Islamic State and other terrorist organizations listed on the UN list.

Since the beginning of the crisis, the EU has mobilized all the political and humanitarian instruments at its disposal to support the Syrian people, remaining one of the main supporters of the UN efforts to reach a political settlement and the main humanitarian donor for the Syrians. With common effort, the EU Member States mobilized more than € 10.8 billion in humanitarian aid, development assistance, economic assistance and stabilization.

The EU actions define the six strategic objectives set out in the EU Strategy for Syria 2017. The document was last approved by the EU foreign ministers in April 2018. The European Union strategic goals:

- Ending the war through a genuine political transition in accordance with the UN Security Council Resolution 2254, under the auspices of the UN Special Envoy for Syria and with the support of key international and regional actors;
- Facilitate a significant and comprehensive transition in Syria in accordance with the UN Security Council Resolution 2254 and the Geneva Communiqué by supporting the strengthening of political opposition;
- Ensuring the salvation and preservation of life by meeting the humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable Syrians across the country in a timely, effective, efficient and principled manner;
- Promote democracy, human rights and freedom of speech by strengthening Syrian civil society organizations;
- Encourage accountability for war crimes in order to facilitate national reconciliation and transitional justice;
- Maintain the sustainability of the Syrian population and Syrian society.

The European Union Strategy for Syria is an addition to the EU's regional strategy on Iraq, Syria and the Islamic State. It emphasizes the EU's adaptation to the changing situation and challenges, and also aims to combat the remnants of the Islamic State (ISIS) and stabilize the liberated areas in Syria. The EU actions against ISIS support the Global Coalition and demonstrate the EU's full commitment to fighting terrorism both inside and outside the EU by non-military means. The EU's activities in Syria include countering violent extremism and radicalization, restricting the ISIS's financial flows, supporting dialogue initiatives, efforts to rehabilitate and reconcile communities in territories previously usurped by terrorists, assistance in the investigation of human rights violations, transitional justice. The EU promotes law enforcement accountability, independent media and mine clearance. Brussels established an autonomous sanction regime against the ISIS and other terrorist groups in September 2016.

Syria remains a priority for the EU, which is constantly working to ensure the the Syrian conflict to remain on the international agenda. In 2017, the EU hosted the first Brussels conference to support the future structure of Syria and the region. The second such event was held again in Brussels on April 24-25, 2018 in which the UN acted as co-chair. Both conferences brought together over 70 delegations at the ministerial level from the international community, including countries of the region to accomplish three tasks:

I. To confirm the support of the EU and the international community for a political method for resolving the Syrian conflict, to consolidate global support for mediation efforts and facilitate the Syrian negotiations under the leadership of the United Nations in Geneva.

II. To strengthen support and improve conditions to ensure an international response to arising humanitarian needs.

III. To support an international participation in helping Syrians, both in Syria and in neighboring countries.

The EU actively calls on all Parties to end hostilities and violence in relation to civilians. During the conflict, some objects of the cultural heritage of mankind were destroyed, which is also a sad consequence of the war. The EU condemns human rights abuses and ongoing widespread violence. The EU has provided €1.5 million to support an international impartial and independent mechanism to assist in the investigation and prosecution of those responsible for the most serious crimes under international law committed in Syria.

The European Union strongly reacted to the violent repression of anti-government protests in Syria in 2011, suspending cooperation with the Syrian government and gradually expanding targeted restrictive measures (humanitarian exceptions). In the future, the EU will continue its policy of imposing sanctions against the regime and its supporters, as long as the repression continues. On May 28, 2018 the Council extended the EU restrictive measures until June 1, 2019. In particular, currently used sanctions include the oil embargo, restrictions on certain investments, freezing of the assets of the Syrian central bank within the EU, export restrictions on equipment and technologies that can be used for internal repression, as well as equipment and technologies for monitoring and interception of the

Internet or telephone. Currently, the sanctions list includes 259 people and 67 organizations that are subject to the travel ban and assets freeze due to violent repression against the civilian population in Syria.

The EU was at the forefront of establishing international control over Syrian chemical weapons, which ultimately led to their destruction. In March 2016, the EU provided funding of € 4.6 million to special missions of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in the Syrian Arab Republic, including activities related to the UN Fact-Finding Mission and the Joint Investigative Mechanism (UNSCR 2235). The fourth JIM report was published in October 2016. The EU made a statement at the OPCW on March 7, 2017. On July 17, 2017 and March 19, 2018 the Council added 16 and 4 people respectively to the list of the EU restriction. These were measures against the Syrian regime, especially for its role in the development and use of chemical weapons against civilians.

The EU Delegation to Syria continues to work from Beirut, carrying out regular missions to Damascus.

Since the beginning of the crisis, the EU and its Member States have allocated more than € 10.8 billion in humanitarian aid and stabilization. This fact proves that the EU is the leading donor. Since 2011, the support of the European Commission has exceeded € 5.2 billion, including both urgent humanitarian life-saving aid and non-humanitarian aid that meets immediate and medium-term needs. The commission has allocated nearly € 1.1 billion in aid to civilians in Syria, of which almost 70% or € 753 million is humanitarian aid. Non-humanitarian assistance is € 268.6 million from ENI, € 83.8 million from IcSP, € 16.1 million from EIDHR and € 15.9 million from DCI-Food.

In April 2018, the Brussels Conference on Syria and the region was held, where commitments were made to allocate for Syria and neighboring countries affected by the crisis (Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt) the total amount of € 3.5 billion in 2018, and also grants worth € 2.7 billion for the period 2019 and 2020. The EU and its Member States provided 77% of the total pledges (€ 4.8 billion from € 6.2 billion pledged for the period from 2018 to 2020).

International financial institutions and donors also announced loans of € 17.2 billion. The European Commission itself promised € 560 million for Lebanon, Jordan and Syria in 2018 and the same level of funding in 2019. According to the latest financial report published in September 2018, donors have already deposited 95% of the total bail € 3.3 billion for 2018. At the first Brussels conference a year earlier, the international community confirmed funding of € 5.6 billion to support humanitarian activities, sustainable development activities in 2017 to resolve the crisis in Syria, of which € 3.7 billion came from the EU and its Member States.

A report on financial tracking of commitments from Brussels, published in April 2018, showed that donors allocated grants of € 7 billion for 2017 for Syria and neighboring countries affected by the crisis (Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Egypt), and therefore having exceeded the initial deposit of € 5.6 billion by 26%.

Since 2011 the European Commission has provided € 1.65 billion to save the lives of those in need in Syria and beyond.

The EU funds humanitarian programs carried out by its partners, such as the UN agencies, international organizations and international NGOs. All EU partners are obliged to respect the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence from the political, religious or ethnic affiliation of the beneficiaries and have to react exclusively to humanitarian needs.

In Syria, due to the humanitarian assistance an emergency response in the following key sectors is provided in the first place: food; health; shelter and essentials; water; sanitation and hygiene; protection and education in emergency situations. The EU also provides support to humanitarian partners in planning reserves and contingency planning to predict new population movements.

However, the humanitarian and defence situation remains extremely difficult for civilians in many parts of the country, including where fighting is still ongoing. There is still a need for food, health care and protection, as well as lack of access to basic services and life-saving goods. Although humanitarian convoys have recently gained access to some hard-to-reach areas in the south and central Syria, access to approximately 2.9 million people. Thus, access to hard-to-reach and besieged areas remains a serious problem and a violation of UNSCR 2401.

The EU has consistently called and calls for an effective cease-fire, respect for international humanitarian law (IHL) and human rights, protection of civilians, especially children, women and other vulnerable groups. The EU insists on stopping the indiscriminate and targeted bombing of civilian infrastructure, such as schools, hospitals and humanitarian facilities. The EU also calls for protecting relief workers and ensuring unimpeded, unconditional and sustained humanitarian access to all in need.

In neighboring countries, hosting refugees (Turkey, Jordan and Lebanon), the EU also provides substantial support to more than 2.5 million refugees in accessing housing, financial assistance, saving lives and preserving health, medical care, and psycho-social assistance.

Since the beginning of the crisis due to the rescue humanitarian assistance provided by the European Commission:

- About 2 million people had access to safe water, sanitation and hygiene.
- More than 4 million people received medical care.
- 850,000 people received food.
- 1 million people received basic necessities and housing.
- 350,000 children were enrolled in child protection programs.
- More than 2 million children under the age of five receive vaccines.
- Thousands of children out of school receive education in emergency programs.

In 2018, the EU allocated € 280 million of humanitarian aid to millions of vulnerable Syrians within the country and refugees who fled to neighboring countries. Therefore, around € 140 million of this amount were intended for Syria.

Since the Syrians have fled conflict to neighboring countries from the beginning of the crisis, these states have accepted an unprecedented number of

refugees. The European Union supports Syrian refugees and their host communities in Lebanon, Jordan, Turkey and Iraq.

Jordan. There are over 650,000 Syrian refugees registered in Jordan, and half of these refugees are children. The EU leaders met with representatives of Jordan and visited the country many times over the past five years.

In 2017, around € 55 million EU humanitarian funding allocated to Jordan was also intended to meet the humanitarian needs of more than 45,000 refugees along its northeast border with Syria and Iraq. Another € 36 million was allocated for 2018.

The Commission's humanitarian assistance helped Syrian refugees and vulnerable host communities gain access to medical care, food and basic needs, and support for winter preparations, housing, water and sanitation, as well as psychosocial support and protection. Since about 80% of the refugees in Jordan live in urban environments, the Commission supports the most vulnerable refugees in the cities. The EU also finances specific programs to meet the needs of women and children, because approximately 51% of refugees are children. The EU remains particularly concerned about the situation on the border with Syria, where about 50,000 people remain in distress and have limited access to emergency assistance.

In addition, the EU allocated an average of € 100 million per year to bilateral assistance (all grants) to Jordan in accordance with the European Neighborhood Policy, resulting in a total amount of aid exceeding € 1.8 billion.

Lebanon. In Lebanon, the EU provides financial aid, secondary medical care, emergency education and shelters (including water supply, hygiene and sanitation) to improve the often very poor living conditions of displaced families. The EU partners regularly monitor key protection issues and provide counseling and legal assistance. Since 2012, the EU Humanitarian Aid to Lebanon reached about 750,000 Syrians. The EU Humanitarian Aid Funding amounted to € 80 million for 2018.

There are about 976,000 registered Syrian refugees in the country, representing a quarter of the Lebanese population, which is the highest concentration of refugees per capita in the world.

The 2018 Brussels Conference welcomed the Lebanese government vision on stabilization, growth and employment, the investment program, and the government's commitment to scheduling reforms. To date, the European Commission has allocated Lebanon more than € 1.3 billion in aid since 2011, both for bilateral aid (€ 268 million) and specifically in reaction to the Syrian crisis (more than € 1 billion). This amount includes humanitarian aid in the amount of € 519 million, as well as assistance intended to meet the long-term needs of affected civilians.

Turkey. Over 3.5 million Syrian refugees are registered in Turkey, which means that Turkey has the largest absolute number of refugees than any other country in the world. In March 2016, the EU confirmed that it would provide financial assistance to Turkey for resolving the issue of receiving refugees under the existing program for refugees in Turkey. This assistance will be provided in

two tranches of € 3 billion. The fund is engaged in humanitarian aid, education, migration management, healthcare, social and economic support, and municipal infrastructure. The first tranche, drawn up from the budgets for 2016 and 2017, was allocated and concluded by the end of last year (72 projects), and today more than € 1.9 billion has been allocated. The balance will be distributed in accordance with the implementation. In June 2018, the EU agreed to mobilize the second tranche in 2018 and 2019. About € 450 million has already been allocated, and the balance for these commitments should be taken by the end of 2019.

Iraq. The crisis in Iraq is closely linked to the Syrian crisis. The crisis in Iraq, as well as in Syria, is an emergency situation of the 3rd level of the UN. In Iraq, 11 million people need humanitarian assistance within 36 million of its population. This number includes 3 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) and 247,000 refugees from Syria.

The European Commission is increasing its humanitarian assistance to help the most vulnerable people in Iraq. In 2018, the EU allocated an additional € 40 million for humanitarian aid. The EU assistance covers the basic needs of the most vulnerable population in Iraq, including food, health, water, sanitation and hygiene, as well as protection, shelter and education in emergency.

Egypt. In Egypt, there are 233,000 registered refugees and asylum seekers, including 130,300 refugees from Syria. The EU allocated € 7.9 million to help refugees living in substandard conditions in urban areas through programs dedicated to the protection of vulnerable people and health care assistance. An additional € 4 million was planned for 2018.

Conflict Matrix / Syria

Parties to the conflict:

- The legitimate Syrian government under the leadership of B. Assad;
- Pro-Western opposition (“Free Syrian Army”, etc.);
- Kurdish militia (“Peshmerga”) and political movement for creation of Kurdish statehood;
- the group "Islamic State" (ISIS) (banned in the Russian Federation).

International intervention: three coalitions of states (all without the UN mandate): the coalition of the Syrian government B. Assad and Russia (on the basis of a written agreement of the legitimate governments of the two states). The coalition conducts irregular coordination with the governments of Iraq and Iran. Russia has created the Reconciliation Center. A coalition of Western countries (USA, France, Germany, etc.) supporting the pro-Western opposition within Syria, as well as Turkey, on the one hand, and the actions of the Kurds against the ISIS on the other (which contradicts the interests of Turkey).

Arab Coalition under the leadership of Saudi Arabia.

Antialavit (antiassad) positions. Initially, the coalition of 23 states was declared, but membership of many Arab countries is formal and passive.

The results of the intervention, the outcome of the conflict resolving: the return, due to the support of the Russian Aerospace Forces, strategic initiative to the government in Damascus in 2015 and 2016 which has expanded the controlled territory, but unable to regain control over the entire territory of Syria. The

narrowing of the territories controlled by the ISIS, under the pressure from government forces with the support of the Russian Aerospace Forces, as well as the Kurdish militia. Irregular dialogue between the government and three coalitions on elections in the country and the prospects for the federalization of Syria.

Chronology of the conflict

| 2011 | |
|-------------|---|
| March | Social unrest and anti-government protests swept Syria's major cities |
| April 21 | The state of emergency since 1963 has been lifted. |
| April | Government forces are involved in suppressing unrest. |
| May 10 | EU sanctions against Syria come into effect: arms embargo, sanctions for individual members of the Syrian government. |
| May 23 | Syrian President B. Assad is on the EU sanctions list. |
| August 4 | B. Asad approved a decree introducing a multi-party system in the country and organizing general elections. |
| October 4 | Veto of Russia and China in the UN Security Council on a draft resolution on international intervention in the Syrian conflict. |
| November 12 | Suspended Syria's membership in the League of Arab States (LAS). |
| 2012 | |
| February 4 | Russia and China vetoed again on Draft Resolution on intervention in Syria |
| February 26 | The Referendum adopted a new Constitution of Syria. |
| April 21 | The UN Security Council adopted Russian Draft Resolution No. 2043, which was developed on the basis of the United Nations mission to monitor the cease-fire in Syria for a period of 90 days. Former the UN Secretary General Kofi Annan visited Syria as Special Envoy for conflict resolving. |
| May 7 | In Syria the first elections to the National Council (Parliament) on a multi-party basis were held. The Bloc "National Unity" supporting B. Assad won the elections. |
| July 18 | The death of several key figures in the leadership of Syria as a result of the terrorist act: the Minister of Defence D. Rajh, his deputy for security issues, a relative of President A. Shaukat, head of the Anti-Crisis Committee X. Thurmani. |

| | |
|----------|--|
| August | Military actions cover almost all areas of the country. |
| November | The Syrian National Coalition was formed, bringing together a number of opposition forces. |

2013

| | |
|--------------|--|
| March 12 | Anti-government groups used chemical weapons in battles in the province of Aleppo. |
| June 5 | The Syrian army conquers the key border town of Al-Qusayr with the support of the Lebanese organization Hezbollah. |
| July 31 | In Northeast Syria, the Kurds declared general mobilization, their clashes with Islamist groups intensified. |
| August 19 | The UN experts on chemical weapons began the work in Syria based on the UN Security Council Resolution 2118 on international control and destruction of Syrian chemical weapons. |
| August 21 | The use of chemical weapons in the suburbs of Damascus were recorded, which led to massive deaths. |
| September 10 | The Syrian government agreed to place under international control their chemical weapons stockpiles. |
| October 14 | Syria officially became the 190th member of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW). |
| November 12 | Syrian Kurds announced the creation of the interim body in the territory inhabited by the Kurds in the north and Northeast Syria. |
| November 22 | Six Islamist militant groups of Syria united into a single military structure called the Islamic Front, the organization joined the struggle with government forces and with units of the opposition Syrian Free Army (SFA). |
| December 7 | Militants of the "Islamic Front" seized the headquarter and military warehouses of the SFA. |

2014

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| January - February | International Conference "Geneva-2" on the Syrian resolving. |
| June 3 | B. Assad won the presidential election, gaining 88.7% of the vote. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| June 23 | The last batch of chemical weapons components has been exported from Syria. Russian military escort weapons exportation, then it is destroyed on the US Navy ships. |
| July | The ISIS captured all major oil fields in the east of Syria. |
| August 19 | The disposal process of the chemical weapons arsenal declared by Syria has been completed. |
| September 23 | The U.S Air Force and the international coalition air forces launched the first air strikes against Islamist positions of the ISIS and Dzhebbat an-Nusra groups in Syria. |
| 2015 | |
| January 5 | Kurdish Self-Defense Forces (KSF) ousted the ISIS militants from Kobani. |
| May 21 | The territory of ancient Palmyra captured by the ISIS. |
| September | Russian military aircraft makes the first air raids in Syria, the main purpose of which was to defeat the forces of the ISIS. |
| November | Russian Aerospace Forces deploy a large-scale operation in cooperation with the Syrian government forces on the basis of an Intergovernmental Agreement Syria-RF. |
| December | UK joins the ISIS bombings by the U.S Air Force. |
| 2016 | |
| February | Russia and the United States jointly submit a Draft Cease-fire Agreement in Syria. |
| March | Syrian state regains control over the territory of Palmyra with the Russian aviation support. |
| April | The active phase of the Russian Aerospace Forces ¹ operation in Syria is completed. |
| August | A humanitarian operation is being carried out to remove the civilian population from Aleppo and a joint operation of government troops and Russian Aerospace Forces to crowding out the ISIS from Aleppo. |
| September | Russia and the United States jointly announce the cessation of hostilities. Russia coordinates actions with the Damascus authorities, and the USA - with a moderate opposition group. |

* The matrix and chronology of the conflict in Syria // Nikitin A.I. International conflicts: intervention, peacemaking, resolving. -M., 2017.-384 p. (pp.363-367)

Control questions and tasks for self-control:

1. What are the causes and reasons for the crisis in Ukraine?
2. What mechanisms has the EU applied to resolve the conflict? What does “Norman format” mean?

3. What are the 6 priority areas of the EU Strategy for Syria? What are the results of the EU assistance to Syria?
4. What countries other than Syria, the EU provides assistance in the framework of the resolving the Syrian conflict?
5. With which international organizations does the EU cooperate to resolve the conflict in Syria?
6. Having studied the matrix and chronology of the conflict in Ukraine and Syria, it is necessary to fill in the data for 2017, 2018 and 2019.
7. To carry out a comparative analysis of expert views on the conflicts in Ukraine and Syria.